Amendments to the Drawings:

No amendments are made to the Drawings herein.

REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected all claims either under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) or under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) primarily in view of Park et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,295,061). Applicant respectfully asks the Examiner to reconsider these rejections in view of the below Remarks.

The present invention is directed to a web attract loop (i.e., a screensaver) which automatically displays web content after detection of an idle period of predetermined duration, which can be downloaded without user intervention, which does not require user installation on a user computer, and which includes media which can be modified by a third party without user intervention. In this regard, all claims as amended require, among other limitations, attract loop code transmitted along with a web page from a central computer to a browser on a user computer, which attract loop code monitors the user computer for a user event, and then requests and/or displays attract loop content ***only*** if the monitored user event ***does not occur*** within a specified time period.

Applicant respectfully submits that at least the above-highlighted elements are not disclosed, taught or suggested in any way by Park et al., either alone or when properly combined with any other reference.

In the Final Office Action dated July 12, 2006, the Examiner cites various portions of Park et al. (i.e., column 3, lines 28-30 and 44-50; column 9, line 62 - column 10, line 6) as disclosing the above-highlighted limitations. However, as is explicitly recognized by the Examiner, Park et al. states: "Moreover, the pointing device actively further includes a combination of standard events such as **a lapse of time regardless of any user's point device activity**." This is not even close to what is claimed.

As stated above, all claims require that the web attract loop requests and/or displays attract loop content ***only*** if the monitored user event ***does not occur*** within a specified time period. Thus, for example, if the monitored event is movement of a mouse and the specified time period is 5 minutes, the web attract loop would request and/or display attract loop content ***only*** if mouse was not moved for 5 minutes. On the other hand, if the mouse was, in fact, moved within the past 5 minutes, the web attract loop would *not* request or display the attract loop content (because it displays the attract loop content *only* if the monitored user event does not occur within the specified time period).

The cited feature of Park et al., on the other hand is merely a timer which displays advertising images to a user when a specified time has elapsed. Thus, even if the Park et al. system was monitoring mouse movements, Park et al. discloses that the advertising images would be displayed after lapsing of the specified time period (e.g., 5 minutes) *regardless of whether or not the mouse was moved* within the past 5 minutes. Thus, it can not be argued that the Park et al. system displays the advertising images ***only*** if the monitored user event does not occur within a specified time period. The Park et al. system displays the advertising images if the monitored event occurred within the specified time period *and* if the monitored event did not occur within the specified time period. This is a simple timer and is not at all what is claimed.

It is well settled that the mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination or modification. *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680, 16 U.S.P.Q.2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990). It is also well settled that if the proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified

unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification. *In re Gordon*, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984). In the present case, Applicant respectfully submits that not only is there no suggestion or motivation provided for one skilled in the art to modify Park et al. such that the advertising image reappears only if a monitored user event does not occur within a specified time period, but also that Park et al. actually teaches away from such a modification.

As discussed in more detail in the Response to Official Action filed May 15, 2006,one of the main objectives of Park et al. is to react to the user's movement of the mouse. As pointed out by the Examiner in the Final Office Action dated July 12, 2006, another objective of Park et al. is to display advertising information after a lapse of time regardless of any user's point device activity. It would make absolutely no sense to modify Park et al. such that the advertising image appeared and/or reappeared only if a monitored user event does not occur within a specified time period. Doing so is exactly the opposite of what is taught by Park et al. More specifically, Applicant respectfully submits that one skilled in the art would not modify a reference, the objectives of which are to react to a user's movement of a mouse and/or to display advertising images to a user regardless of the user's movement of a mouse, to cause an image to appear and/or reappear only if the user is idle or the user is no longer present (i.e., there is no user movement of the mouse). The present invention is directed to an improved and novel screen saver, while Park et al. is specifically directed to a system that reacts to user input and that displays advertising images on a periodic basis (regardless of user activity). The two systems are completely incongruous, and Applicant respectfully submits that one skilled in the art would not modify one system to arrive at the other.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims, namely Claims 1-44, are patentable over the references of record, and earnestly solicits allowance of the same.

Respectfully submitted,

August 17, 2006

Wesley W. Whitmyer, Jr., Reg. No. 33,558
Todd M. Oberdick, Reg. No. 44,268
ST. ONGE STEWARD JOHNSTON & REENS LLC
986 Bedford Street
Stamford, Connecticut 06905-5619
(203) 324-6155
Attorneys for Applicant